S. HRG. 99-776

NOMINATION OF GEORGE S. DUNLOP

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-NINTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

THE NOMINATION OF
GEORGE S. DUNLOP, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

JUNE 5, 1986

Printed for the use of the
Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
62-483 O WASHINGTON : 1986

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

S161-18

62-483 O - 86 - 1

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

JESSE HELMS, North Carolina, *Chairman*

BOB DOLE, Kansas	EDWARD ZORINSKY, Nebraska
RICHARD G. LUGAR, Indiana	PATRICK J. LEAHY, Vermont
THAD COCHRAN, Mississippi	JOHN MELCHER, Montana
RUDY BOSCHWITZ, Minnesota	DAVID H. PRYOR, Arkansas
PAULA HAWKINS, Florida	DAVID L. BOREN, Oklahoma
MARK ANDREWS, North Dakota	ALAN J. DIXON, Illinois
PETE WILSON, California	HOWELL HEFLIN, Alabama
MITCH McCONNELL, Kentucky	TOM HARKIN, Iowa

KEITH H. WEATHERLY, *Chief of Staff*
TERRANCE J. WEAR, *General Counsel*
CARL P. ROSE, *General Counsel and Staff Director for the Minority*
WARREN B. OXFORD, *Printer/Chief Clerk*

CONTENTS

	Page
Helms, Hon. Jesse, a U.S. Senator from North Carolina, opening statement	1
Zorinsky, Hon. Edward, a U.S. Senator from Nebraska	4
Harkin, Hon. Tom, a U.S. Senator from Iowa	7

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF WITNESSES

East, Hon. John P., a U.S. Senator from North Carolina	1
Warner, Hon. John W., a U.S. Senator from Virginia	2
Dunlop, George S., Assistant Secretary-Designate for Natural Resources and Environment, U.S. Department of Agriculture	5

SUBMITTED QUESTIONS FROM SENATORS

Questions from Senator Melcher and Mr. Dunlop's answers thereto	9
Questions from Senator Sasser and Mr. Dunlop's answers thereto	14

APPENDIX

Dole, Hon. Bob, a U.S. Senator from Kansas, statement	15
Zorinsky, Hon. Edward, a U.S. Senator from Nebraska, statement	16
Hawkins, Hon. Paula, a U.S. Senator from Florida, statement	16
Wilson, Hon. Pete, a U.S. Senator from California, statement	17
McConnell, Hon. Mitch, a U.S. Senator from Kentucky, statement	17
Dixon, Hon. Alan J., a U.S. Senator from Illinois, statement	18
Martin, David H., Director, U.S. Office of Government Ethics, letter dated May 27, 1986, to Senator Helms	19
Dunlop, George S., chief of staff, U.S. Senate, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, letter dated June 2, 1986, to Senator Helms	19
Biographical sketch of Mr. Dunlop	20
Flamm, Barry R., chief forester, Wilderness Society, statement	20
Johnson, Robert W., letter dated June 2, 1986, to Senator Helms	22

NOMINATION OF GEORGE S. DUNLOP TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

THURSDAY, JUNE 5, 1986

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:07 a.m., in room SR-332, Russell Senate Office Building, Hon. Jesse Helms (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Senators Helms, Zorinsky, Dixon, and Harkin.

STATEMENT OF HON. JESSE HELMS, A U.S. SENATOR FROM NORTH CAROLINA

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Good morning. The first thing we are going to do is vote to keep George Dunlop here.

The committee is going to operate in a somewhat convoluted fashion this morning. I recognize that the two visiting Senators have presiding responsibilities of their own, and, therefore, with a word of welcome to them, and gratitude to them for coming here this morning, I will recognize, first, my distinguished colleague from North Carolina, and then the distinguished Senator from Virginia, Mr. Warner.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN P. EAST, A U.S. SENATOR FROM NORTH CAROLINA

Senator EAST. Mr. Chairman, I will be mercifully brief this morning because I know you have a great deal to do.

I am here, of course, on behalf of the nomination of George Dunlop by the President to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources and Environment.

I know that you, and members of the committee, are much aware of his administrative talent and ability, and accomplishments on this committee, so I do not think I can do anything but simply underscore what you already know.

But I would like to add, Mr. Chairman, that as the junior Senator from North Carolina, we are profoundly proud that he is a native of North Carolina.

He was born in Charlotte, spent years in Salisbury, is a graduate of Catawba College, and received his MA degree from Lehigh University.

As you are aware, he has had considerable experience here on Capitol Hill, and I do not know of anyone who has had any con-

tacts with George, who has not been extremely impressed with his ability, his integrity, and his commitment.

If my recollection is correct, Mr. Chairman, he began with you in 1973 as a special assistant. He then became minority staff director for the committee in 1979 and served with great distinction in that post until he became chief of staff in 1981. The President has now seen fit to nominate him for the post of Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources and Environment.

I can report from North Carolina—and I suspect, Mr. Chairman, this would hold up nationwide—that George has earned an exceedingly fine reputation for being able to work with all segments of the agricultural spectrum, and I think he will bring this great experience, this great intelligence, this great integrity of his, to the Department of Agriculture, and to this role as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is my great pleasure, for what it is worth, to underscore, as the junior Senator from North Carolina, that I think this is an excellent nomination.

I hope that your committee will give it very prompt consideration. I know you will give a very balanced and fair consideration, and I do candidly believe that the committee will report this out, I hope unanimously favorably, and I look forward to supporting it and voting for it on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your solicitude here and I wish the very best to George Dunlop. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator, thank you very much. I might add that we have sort of a lock on at the present time and it will continue. I should not mention this in the presence of Ed Zorinsky, but both the minority staff director and the chief of staff of the committee are North Carolinians. The distinguished Carl Rose is from Rocky Mount, NC. They have been on this committee for a long time.

Senator EAST. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate it.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Warner.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN W. WARNER, A U.S. SENATOR FROM VIRGINIA

Senator WARNER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I shall be brief. You have just recounted the values of persons from North Carolina. I am privileged to be here today to represent the nominee by virtue of the fact of being the Senator from his chosen, really, electoral State of Virginia. [Laughter.]

We do have a few border disputes, but, by and large, the two States live in relative harmony.

Mr. Chairman, my distinguished colleague, who is recognized amongst his peers as being one of the most eloquent Members ever to have served in the U.S. Senate, has pretty well said it all.

I join and associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from North Carolina, in expressing the confidence and the admiration that the Members of the U.S. Senate—both sides of the aisle—have in this nominee to be the Assistant Secretary of the Department of Agriculture.

He has served his country, the Senate, with great distinction, I believe, for 14 years, and I am glad to be among those to give my

unreserved support, and I hope this committee acts with its usual promptness on this nomination.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. Two very fine statements, and I know that George and his family appreciate what you have said, both of you, and will remember it, and we are very grateful to you for coming here this morning.

Senator WARNER. Now I expect the nominee is on his own.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir. He may want to quit while he is ahead.

Senator WARNER. I thank Mr. Zorinsky for his patience.

The CHAIRMAN. Ed, I went out of order because both of them have committee responsibilities of their own.

I sat down last night to give some thought to what I should say about George S. Dunlop whose nomination by the President of the United States the committee meets this morning to consider.

Specifically as has been mentioned, George has been nominated to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources and Environment.

Now, I think the worse thing that I could do to George would be even to risk being maudlin in what I am about to say about him. I hope I can avoid that.

George has occupied a very special place in Mrs. Helms' and my heart, and he is, in a very real way, the "second son" in the Helms family. Suffice it to say, for a very long time, since that day in 1972 when I first met him, fresh out of the Marine Corps, he has been important to me in a highly personal way as well as professional. Now every member of this committee, indeed, every Member of the Senate, is aware of the remarkable service George has rendered to this committee since 1979 when he became minority staff director, and since 1981, when he became chief of staff of this committee.

So, I am not going to recite the details of the enormous contribution George has made, except to say that I have never known anyone more dedicated, more committed, or more willing, to work hard and effectively.

He is extraordinary. He is a real pro. Last night, I thought of some words that I had read many years ago by Macaulay.

I decided that maybe, if I were correct in my recollection of what Macaulay said, that it would be fitting to find that quote, and to recite it here this morning. Because I think it, in a very real way, is sort of a parallel of George Dunlop's philosophy.

In any case, Macaulay said this about government. He said:

> Our rulers will best promote the improvement of the Nation by strictly confining themselves to their own legitimate duties, by leaving capital to find its most lucrative course, commodities their fair price, industry and intelligence their natural reward, idleness and folly their natural punishment, by maintaining peace, by defending prosperity, and by observing strict economy in every department of the State, let the government do this—

Macaulay said—

> Because the people will assuredly do the rest.

I said that fits George Dunlop, as I have known him, and his interest in and dedication to the principles of free enterprise.

Macaulay did not mention perhaps the most important facet in George's being. That is, his unswerving religious faith; not the kind

of commitment that some wear on their lapels, but indelibly in and upon his heart.

George, that is as maudlin as I am going to get.

Several members of George's family are here this morning, and with the committee's indulgence, I would like to recognize them.

First, his wife Becky, herself a remarkable young lady of character, intelligence, and dedication. Becky, will you stand up, please. Just remain standing.

George's father, Kenneth Dunlop. I have heard so much about you through the years; you have got a son who loves you.

Becky's parents, Carl and Helen Norton of Columbus, OH; if you will stand, please. I might add, Mr. Norton is a retired minister, and because he is, and because he was going to participate in a ceremony some years ago, I had the privilege, Ed, of giving away Becky Norton to George Dunlop. Becky's sister, Rachel Norton, also of Columbus. You cannot hide back there; you can run but you cannot hide. Mr. and Mrs. Paul Vandercore of Coral Springs, FL. Becky's uncle and aunt. There they are. Well, we are delighted to have you here this morning, and I think you can already diagnose that we are very proud of George. Thank you very much for standing.

I think it speaks well, Ed, that so many Senators have come to me and said "I want to put a statement in the record, I'm going to try to be there," and as you have noted, John Warner and John East just departed after their statements.

So, without objection, the statements filed by the Senators will be included and made a part of the record.

Senator Zorinsky.

STATEMENT OF HON. EDWARD ZORINSKY, A U.S. SENATOR FROM NEBRASKA

Senator ZORINSKY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am looking forward to working with George Dunlop in his new position as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

I request that my prepared statement be placed in the record.[1]

I have always found George to be very informative and knowledgeable.

I concur with all the nice things that have been said about George. I have found that George is knowledeable beyond the realm of agriculture. In speaking with some people the other day about a very technical subject, which did not specifically deal with agriculture, George displayed more of a background on the subject than the people who were explaining the subject to the two of us.

George, I am sure, it is nice to hear all of these things, especially while you are still alive. [Laughter.]

George, I look forward to your speedy confirmation. Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the committee will waive the customary waiting period between the nomination hearing and meeting to vote on the nominee.

In this connection, I understand we are going to try to meet after the Saudi vote this afternoon.

---

[1] See p. 16 for the prepared statement of Senator Zorinsky.

The CHAIRMAN. After the Saudi vote. Very well.

Senator ZORINSKY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Ed. George, I think it is about time you came up here and defended yourself, so why do you not take a chair there.

Mr. DUNLOP. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. You understand, though, that all of this is irrelevant; when we get mad at you, that is it. [Laughter.]

Mr. DUNLOP. I understand that process; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Harkin, do you have any statement?

Senator HARKIN. Not right now, Mr. Chairman. Please proceed. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Senator HARKIN. I would like to reserve just a couple of minutes to make a statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly; certainly. Mr. Dunlop, we are delighted to have you here, and you are the one, with Carl Rose, who put the policy in, that if you want to summarize your statement and put the full statement in the record, that will be done by unanimous consent.

But seriously, proceed as you wish.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE S. DUNLOP, ASSISTANT SECRETARY-DESIGNATE FOR NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. DUNLOP. Well, thank you, Senator. I will speak briefly from the heart, I guess, by saying that I am certainly overwhelmed by the nice things that have been said this morning.

I am appreciative, and humbled, and honored, and pleased. The friendship I feel for all of you is something that I will remember always. I am very, very grateful for that.

My association with the Senate, and with this committee, is something that makes it a real honor for me to be here, perhaps more so than for many of the nominees that come through here, having served you for 14 years, and the Senate for that long, and this committee for 7 years.

It really brings me to a point of emotion that I have when sitting here contemplating going on to another task. I have the mixed emotions of regret at leaving because we have just done so much and the people here are so kind and thoughtful; and, I have the emotion of apprehension at taking on this new responsibility that I have been asked to do by the President.

But I think that if there is any one emotion that I had to describe more than any other, it would be one of genuine appreciation for the kindnesses that you and Senator Zorinsky, and all the other Senators on this committee have always extended to me. You have been most thoughtful in our dealings, and that has allowed me to grow professionally, and I am very grateful for that.

I might say also, that I do have a real sense of appreciation to President Reagan for nominating me to this post. As you know, I have been involved in the political fortunes of President Reagan long before it became fashionable, and when our only hope of success was a fond hope. It did not seem very practical, back in 1968,

when I first signed on as vice-chairman of Students for Reagan in North Carolina, and went to the Republican National Convention in Miami Beach in that year on his behalf.

Then in 1976, when we went to Kansas City on Governor Regan's behalf—I think you and Senator Laxalt, at that time, were the only two Members of the U.S. Senate who were willing to endorse Governor Reagan's candidacy, and we were there.

Then of course, again, I had the privilege to do that in 1980 on his behalf, and in 1984. So it has a real special meaning for me to be able to serve this President and to serve in a most historic Presidency.

And so those senses of gratitude that I feel is something that is most overwhelming to me. I might also say that I have a sense of wonderment about the tremendous challenge that is ahead. Dick Lyng has an enormous task to lead this Department of Agriculture, and the agriculture industry. To be part of his team is something that I think is going to be interesting and exciting, and I am certain, satisfying.

I thought of a few things that I might like to say to the committee of what I would hope to accomplish, if I were to be confirmed by the Senate.

I would sum this up in three ways. One, I would hope to advance the basic principle in the management, and in the conservation policies of the soil and the water and forest resources of this Nation, that we can and should strive to increase the wealth of the Nation. I would like to do things that could have that basic principle in mind, while, of course, serving the balanced interest of all the people and an economy that is growing, competitive, innovative, and diverse.

The second thing I would like to do beyond that basic principle is just simply do a good job. I would like to contribute leadership to the management of the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service which come under the jurisdiction of the post for which I am being considered. If I can do that in a manner that is worthy of the trust and confidence that has been reposed in me by the President and by the Senate, I will feel that I had really earned my keep.

And then finally I might say as one of the things I would like to do is to give special attention to development of a natural resources policy agenda for the future, so that America can move into the 21st century with a sense of confidence and clear purpose in these matters that relate to our natural resources.

Again, if I am able to accomplish those three things, and keep in mind where I came from, and where we are headed, perhaps I could fulfill the confidence that has been expressed in me here today.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. I do not know if you need to file a written statement. A very fine statement, George.

A couple of questions. They are routinely asked but they are very meaningful.

First, if your nomination is approved by the committee and the Senate, do you promise to respond to requests to appear and testify before this committee and any other duly constituted committee of the Senate?

Mr. DUNLOP. Yes, Senator. I will.

The CHAIRMAN. And if you are confirmed by the Senate, will you faithfully execute the laws passed by Congress, regardless of any prior statements you may have made, or biases you may have held?

Mr. DUNLOP. I shall.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. Senator Zorinsky, questions of the nominee?

Senator ZORINSKY. I have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Harkin.

STATEMENT OF HON. TOM HARKIN, A U.S. SENATOR FROM IOWA

Senator HARKIN. Mr. Chairman, thanks. I do not really have any questions. I am sorry I was a little late getting here. I did not hear the other comments made by the other distinguished Senators who were here.

I just want to add my congratulations to George on his nomination, and to also say that I have worked with George for a long time, even when I was on the House side and you were over here. I have always had a great deal of admiration for his ability. He is an expert, and he is a true professional. Just shepherding the last farm bill through this Congress was a monumental task and he did it in many long nights, and I know long meetings that the staff had, and I sometimes wonder how he did it and still maintained his composure all the time—but he did, and that is the real mark of a professional.

I have always said that even though we have had differences of opinion, that George has always treated us very fairly. I know that my staff has always been treated with the utmost respect and courtesy by George, and, for that, again, I am most appreciative.

So, I would just say that I also want to add my extreme pleasure and support for this nomination. I have always said I have a great deal of respect for George's expertise, his knowledge, and his professional attitude. As I said, he has always been respectful of the differences of opinion that we have around here; the difference in approaches that we have, knowing this is the crucible in which we iron and kind of grind these things out around here.

I know he will carry that attitude with him down to the Department of Agriculture. I only have one real question about his judgment, entering the Marine Corps, but we are all allowed one of those lapses at one time or another in our lifetime. So, I am sure if he had to do it over again, he would have entered the Navy. [Laughter.]

Mr. DUNLOP. I can assure you, Senator, when I informed my father that I had enlisted in the Marine Corps, he had the same reaction.

Senator HARKIN. Smart father; smart father, I will tell you. We have to get you a Navy tie clasp instead of that Marine Corps one. [Laughter.]

But I want to congratulate you and I know you will do a great job down there, George, and thanks for many years of your service to this committee and to the Congress, the Senate of the United States, and I wish you well down there. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Tom.

Well, the Wilderness Society has submitted a statement on the nomination of Mr. Dunlop. In any case, this statement will be made a part of the record. I also have a letter here from Robert Johnson, Esq., to include in the record.[2]

The staff gave me some questions. Let's try one or two of them. Congress has established that the management of our national forests should further multiple use objectives, and that all Forest Service policy decisions should reflect a consideration of those objectives.

What is your opinion of multiple use?

Mr. DUNLOP. Well, as you and Senator Melcher would know, because the two of you had so much to do with writing the National Forest Management Act of 1976, multiple use is required by statute. That is the very purpose of the management of the national forests, and it is a conviction that I share, and am delighted that it is the policy, and will look forward to carrying out those multiple-use objectives in the national forests.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, having a forester as a son, he absolutely is a loud advocate of multiple use in forest management, and he will argue with you about that—he does not get along too well with some of our wilderness people.

The Soil Conservation Service is one of the primary areas of responsibility for the position to which you have been nominated. The farm bill provided for a comprehensive conservation reserve over which you will have substantial policy input. Is it your sense, Mr. Dunlop, that the Conservation Reserve Program, as Congress has written it, provides adequate tools to administer a successful reserve program?

Mr. DUNLOP. Yes, sir. I believe so. A lot of effort went into that over a number of years, and the tools that they have are very, very effective. The signup that they have had the first year is 3.8 million acres, which comes a little short of the goal but is within the statutory guideline. And the people who analyze this believe that in the subsequent years—which will require 10 million acres in the next several years until we get up to a total of 40 million acres—can be accomplished and will be accomplished.

The principal difficulty that they would have is not inherent in the conservation reserve statutes, or the tools, but rather, how the other parts of agricultural policy will interwork with them.

And if we proceed with the conservation compliance requirements of the statute, and if we perhaps discourage some other incentives for people that are now involved, that allow people to indeed encourage people, induce people, to use fragile lands, then I think that the 40-million-acre objective can be reached within the 1990 timeframe provided in law.

The CHAIRMAN. Let's give it our best shot.

Without objection, the committee will meet in room S. 224 following the vote on the Saudi arms sale. Each Senator has been notified of this, and it will just be a pro forma to confirm George. I cannot imagine that there will be a close vote, George. We will see.

---

[2] See p. 20 for the statement of Barry Flamm from the Wilderness Society and p. 22 for the letter from Mr. Johnson.

I see the presence of the distinguished former Member of the House of Representatives from North Carolina who served on the Agriculture Committee of the House, and also world-renowned as a baseball player, "Vinegar" Ben Mizell. Wilmer, we are glad to have you today.

But I guess that is about it, George. Let me explain to the family that the five Senators whom you have seen here this morning obviously cut the breakfast at the White House this morning. The President invited all 100 Senators down.

But, I figured that I ought to be here to usher along, as best I could, the nomination of my fine young friend.

Let me present Keith Weatherly. Keith, stand up. I have selected Keith, who is a longtime member of this committee, to succeed George. I did not use the word replace. Keith is a very fine, competent, dedicated young man himself, and I think you are going to enjoy Keith, and you will know him as well as you have known George. Just as an aside, he, too, is from North Carolina. Tom Boney, are you here? Just raise your hand. Tom is moving into a capacity with Keith to operate this committee, and as I said earlier, Mr. Rose, over here, we value very highly. He is such a cooperative and effective teacher. He has taught me a lot. I was sitting way down there at the end of this table back in 1973, and Herman Talmadge was sitting right here. Things happen, and here I am.

But Carl, we appreciate you. Alan, we were just getting ready to recess, but we would be delighted to hear from you, sir.

Senator DIXON. Mr. Chairman, if you will let me put a statement in the record and go to the Armed Services Committee, I will vote for George.[3]

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you so much, and I know George appreciates it, and so do I. Now, Alan, you might just say hello to George and his family—wave at them, if you will.

There being no further business to come before the committee we stand in recess until after the vote on the Saudi arms sale.

[Whereupon, at 10:39 a.m., the committee recessed, subject to the call of the Chair.]

COMMITTEE NOTE:

June 5, 1986.—The nomination of George S. Dunlop was reported to the Senate.

June 6, 1986.—The nominee was confirmed by the Senate.

[Questions submitted by Senator Melcher to Mr. Dunlop and answers thereto:]

Question 1. Will you support soil and water conservation districts and their longstanding relationship with SCS, USDA?

Answer. Yes. We must continue our efforts to strengthen the role of state and local units of government, agencies and organizations for soil and water programs on private lands. Soil and water conservation districts are local units of government established under state law. They are governed by a local board of supervisors and exist in nearly 2,800 counties nationwide. The soil and water conservation programs and activities of the SCS are delivered to landowners, farmers and ranchers through districts. It is logical for districts, SCS and USDA to work together in strengthening the state and local role for soil and water conservation program delivery and services.

Question 2. The Administration has proposed to eliminate programs in the soil conservation area that involve a number of personnel, in fact, a reduction from

---

[3] See p. 18 for the prepared statement of Senator Dixon.

14,000 to 10,000. Do you support this plan? If so, how do you propose to provide the technical assistance that the SCS is required to provide to farmers and ranchers?

Answer. Yes, I do support it. The President's 1987 budget request provided for an increase of $15.1 million for conservation technical assistance to cover increased demands for services to farmers and ranchers resulting from the Conservation Reserve. For the USDA as a whole, the President's budget request is the best way to achieve the savings necessary to reach the deficit target that Gramm-Rudman-Hollings mandates.

The alternative to the President's budget appears to be an across-the-board sequester. The USDA cannot operate effectively under a sequster order that would reduce its spending by a given percentage each year, including funds spent for soil and water conservation. USDA spending represents about 5 percent of all Federal spending, but it accounts for almost 30 percent of non-defense spending that is subject to the sequester process. For fiscal year 1988, as Assistant Secretary, I would be an integral part of the budget and policy process within the USDA. I shall strongly defend the President's budget request for soil and water conservation and forestry programs. It is far more desirable for Congress to appove a specific budget that provides for reductions in spending to meet the GRH deficit reduction targets each year. There is no way to accomplish that if each activity is not prioritized. I hope to use the best possible judgment in that regard.

Question. 3. If you support the Administration plan to eliminate the Great Plains Conservation Program, how do you propose to solve the conservation problems on those acres eligible for this program? Are you aware that only 36,000,000 acres have been or are being treated of the 236,000,000 acres that need conservation treatment in the Great Plains? The Conversion Reserve would only treat another 24,000,000. What type of conservation program would you propose for the remaining 176,000,000 acres?

Answer. The plan to terminate the Great Plains Conservation Program is consistent with the decision to terminate other USDA conservation cost-sharing programs, and thereby concentrate limited Federal budget resources on providing technical expertise and coordination. The decision was a matter of setting priorities within a tightly constrained 1987 budget request. The Administration considers technical assistance to be of high priority, especially in view of the servicing needs of the Conservation Title of the Food Security Act of 1985. Financial subsidies are considered to be of lower priority and, therefore, were reduced or eliminated to accommodate budgetary targets and better meet the urgent need for conservation treatment.

The Great Plains Conservation Program (GPCP) was authorized August 7, 1956, by an amendment to the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. Funds for the program were appropriated initially for fiscal year 1958. In total, $500.7 million has been appropriated for the program which is currently authorized in 518 counties of the ten Great Plains States. On the basis of the numbers you cite, this program has cost the taxpayer $14.00 an acre to treat the 36 million acres. It would take another 140 years to treat the remaining acreage. This seems to indicate that GPCP may not be an effective means of accomplishing meaningful conservation practices at a time when funds are declining because of the urgent and compelling need to reduce Federal spending. Also, I notice in the published 1987 House Hearings before the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies, that major benefits achieved by the GPCP include more than 130 million acres adequately protected by 62,818 program participants in the 518 authorized counties. This is a more optimistic appraisal of program performance. Obviously, I will need to review the program carefully before making further value judgments. I look forward to doing this in the months ahead.

Question 4. The RC&D program is one of intergovernmental agency and local people cooperation. It provides assistance to people in remote areas to solve local problems. Flooding projects, critical area erosion projects, reforestation, weed control are all examples of problems that have been solved by RC&D. Much of the input by local people is volunteer, ie., people working together to solve problems with a little Federal assistance. There is a $250,000,000 backlog in new projects, of which only $9,000,000 was funded from the 1986 total RC&D budget of $26,000,000. There are 47 applications for new RC&Ds pending. This program works with a little seed money from the Federal Government. Why eliminate it?

Answer. Again, it is question of priorities. The RC&D program was authorized initially in 1962, through the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. Every budget request since Fiscal Year 1977, both from Democrat and Republican Administrations, has proposed to terminate the program. The Congress continues to appropriate RC&D funds on the basis of citizen support, and a belief that accelerated conservation treatments have helped to improve local rural areas. No doubt, there has been some

improvement. However, numerous RC&D program reviews have been unable to demonstrate a statistically significant difference in progress towards program objectives between RC&D counties. Further, given the fiscal climate, it misleads program constituents to assume that Federal funds are going to be available to service a backlog of $150 million in new projects. Since 1982, the program has been re-oriented to one in which the primary activity is to provide funding for RC&D Project Coordinators instead of the less effective purpose of providing direct financial subsidies. This is a healthy change because many of the program objectives are local in nature, rather than a Federal reponsibility. The proposal to terminate the program is based on this assessment together with the fiscal constraints of the 1987 budget.

Question 5. The small watershed program is also one that has been used successfully by local people on the upper reaches of rivers and streams for flood control, irrigation water storage and recreation. Aren't these the types of projects we should be building, i.e., small projects on the upper watershed versus huge dams lower down on the rivers? Do you agree with the Administration proposal to eliminate PL-566?

Answer. Yes. The small watershed protection program has been very successful in reducing upstream flood damages since authorized by Public Law 566, The Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, approved August 4, 1954. However, it is questionable whether this program can continue to be justified as a proper use of Federal funds, particularly in the current Federal fiscal situation. Because of this, a policy decision was made by the Administration to terminate the program but continue a "big dam" approach through the Corps of Engineers and others. These larger, often multi-state projects can be supported as a legitimate Federal role.

Many small watershed projects in the upper reaches are local in nature and should be funded and managed at the State and local level without Federal financial assistance. This rationale is consistent with the other 1987 budget decisions for soil and water programs which reduce or eliminate Federal cost-sharing or financial assistance.

Question 6. Water quality is an important and significant issue. What do you see as USDA's role in assisting and working with the agricultural community in solving non-point source pollution problems?

Answer. The USDA is and should be right in the middle of this issue. The Department has recognized for years that some agricultural operations can pollute ground and surface water. Water quality improvement objectives should be fully integrated into USDA soil and water conservation programs. It is my understanding that a number of land treatment small watershed projects have water quality improvement as a primary objective or purpose.

Accelerated water quality program efforts are underway for the Chesapeake Bay, the Great Lakes and other areas where priorities have been established for cleaner water. In many of these areas, non-point pollution from agriculture is a primary source of water degradation.

The Department of Agriculture, through the land grant university and county office system, can deliver the on-the-land information and technology that is needed to address the non-point source water quality problem. However, the Environmental Protection Agency remains the lead Federal Agency for pollution control programs. Within this framework, however, the Soil Conservation Service, the Forest Service and other USDA agencies have a very real responsibility to work with the agricultural community to solve non-point source pollution problems and to continue agricultural operations in an environmentally safe way. The legislative language in the Conservation Title of the 1985 Food Security Act also reinforces my views on this issue.

Question 7. Do you have any plans to dismantle the Soil Conservation Service by reducing budgets and personnel to leavels so low it is no longer possible to provide conservation technical assistance to farmers and ranchers?

Answer. No.

Question 8. Many of the programs you will be charged with overseeing are programs which promote the protection of natural resources on non-federal lands. Most of these programs have been under heavy budget pressure in recent years, as the Office of Management and Budget looks for ways to eliminate spending. What is your general view of the role of the Federal government in helping private landowners with such things as soil and water conservation, reforestation, and rangeland rehabilitation?

Answer. It is true that like most other federal programs, conservation programs have been under heavy budget pressure in recent years, as successive administrations have sought ways to reduce federal spending. This administration has sought to redefine the role of the Federal government, recognizing that it does not have the

resources to be "all things to all people." The role of the Federal government should be in technical assistance and research, rather than in direct financial assistance to landowners. For conservation programs, I support the need to continue strong research, information-education and technical assistance programs to be assured that the benefits of new technology, inventories and assessments reach our farmers, ranchers, and local governments who make land use decisions. It is for this reason that I believe we should continue a strong conservation technical assistance program through soil and water conservation districts in helping private landowners with soil and water conservation, reforestation, and rangeland improvement. In addition, the Federal government has a compelling obligation to assure that its activities do not obviously contribute to or conflict with proper and appropriate use of natural resources. Congress made significant strides in correcting the very negative impacts of farm commodity programs on soil and water conservation in mandating strict sodbuster, swampbuster, and conservation cross-compliance in the 1985 farm bill. One of my greatest contributions as Assistant Secretary would be to assure that these new tools are decisively and effectively carried out.

Question 9. Do you have any views about the manner in which research, education, technical assistance, and cost-sharing should be balanced to carry out what you see as the federal role?

Answer. Sustained productivity and profitability in agriculture, including state of the art technology in soil, water and forestry program delivery, will continue to depend heavily upon basic and applied research. Well directed research can help to lower the cost of inputs and make American agriculture competitive in world markets once again. We need to continue strong research, education and technical assistance programs for the benefit of American's farmers and ranchers and to increase the wealth of the Nation, generally. The private sector, in addition to land grant universities and the USDA, spends enormous sums of money on agricultural research and information activities. The combined public and private effort bodes well for American agriculture. The proper role of the Federal government should be in supporting basic research and in assisting and encouraging the practical application of research results to the farm and forest. Direct cost-sharing and financial assistance to producers is not an appropriate federal role. Over time, cost-sharing and financial assistance programs cause a dependency upon the Federal government which actually diminishes State, and local community, and individual, involvement in resource conservation activities. They encourage inefficient production and distort market signals. They also cause American agriculture to be less able to compete in the global economy.

Question 10. This spring is giving us another example of how forest fires can put an intolerable strain on one state's resources, and how the federally-coordinated cooperative fire progam can benefit both people and land resources by allowing the states to freely share people and equipment. What is your view on the future of that effort? (Reagan budgets have severely cut or eliminated parts of it every year; Congress has restored.)

Answer. The federally coordinated cooperative fire program is an outstanding success story. It has permitted fire fighting organizations to pool resources and be much more effective in concentrating scarce firefighting resources where the need is greatest. It has been one of the most important factors that has allowed the maintenance of fire fighting effectiveness in the face of reduced funding levels.

It is virtually unheard of for all regions of the country to experience high fire danger at the same time. It, therefore, would not be prudent for every fire organization to hire staff to meet the maximum expected fire threat. It is far better to develop the capability and organization that has the flexibility promptly to deploy to areas where the threat is greatest. That is the concept behind this effort and I fully support it. It has been enormously effective.

Question 11. The 1986 Farm Bill created a major new workload for the Soil Conservation Service, particularly in the area of soil surveys for the Sodbuster provisions and conservation plans for the Conservation Reserve. How do you see the new demands being balanced with the ongoing programs of that agency, and what do you plan to do within the Administration to keep that total program in balance? And what do you plan to do within the Administration to assure that the Conservation Reserve successfully completes its goals?

Answer. Indeed, the 1985 Farm Bill did create a new workload for the Soil Conservation Service, particularly for soil surveys and conservation technical assistance in servicing the conservation reserve and the highly erodible lands programs. The agency estimates it will take between 1,600 and 2,000 staff years annually to handle the conservation reserve workload and another 2,700 to 4,000 in total staff years has been mentioned for the highly erodible lands program, commonly referred to as con-

servation compliance, between now and 1990. This is a significant workload. The full implications of this will not be known until the final regulations are developed and implemented. I will need to analyze the projected workload and develop detailed program plans and schedules to service it and hope to work with Congress in doing so. We currently have insufficient information and data to know whether or not it can be accommodated and balanced within the ongoing programs. You can be assured that I will work within the Administration to see that the Conservation Reserve is successfully implemented as intended by the Congress.

Question 12. Also on the Farm Bill subject, the Conservation Reserve is bringing a great many marginal acres into trees, particularly in the South. That promises to help make up for a potentially serious timber shortfall that could develop down there as the old Soil Bank plantings are harvested. But I am hearing that many of the 1985 fall tree plantings are being hard-hit by the record drought now taking place in that region. This is going to throw additional demand on the nursery programs of the state and federal agencies, it would appear. But the Administration continues to insist on cutting funding for the cooperative nursery program. Do you have any views on how to resolve this apparent inconsistency?

Answer. The Forest Service provides technical assistance for nurseries under the Conservation Reserve through its State and Private Cooperative Forestry Program. The Conservation Reserve Program is going to place additional demands on State and private nurseries, and the current drought in 1985 fall tree planting may be further increasing the demand. If seedling demand doubles during the next 5 years due to the Conservation Reserve, the private forest nursery industry, particularly in the Southeastern states, will have an opportunity to significantly increase sales and profits. State nurseries that charge for seedlings will be in a better position to recoup their costs. This is consistent with language in both House and Senate reports on the 1985 Farm Bill, which emphasized the use of private vendors in carrying out the conservation reserve.

Question 13. Many of the programs you will be charged with overseeing are programs which must strike a balance between commodity production and preservation of non-market values. The National Forest System is an excellent example of this. What is your general view of the role of the federal government as both a developer of economically valuable natural resources and a protector of environment amenities for which the market may not set a hard price tag?

Answer. The Federal Government is the custodian of vast quantities of economically valuable natural resources. These resources can and should be managed to meet the needs of the American people for food, fiber, and mineral products, such as oil and gas. The challenge is to develop and manage these resources in a way which not only protects and enhances the basic productivity of the land, but also the amenity values which are important to the quality of life in our country. Fortunately, with proper management there is a large measure of compatibility among the various uses of our forests and rangelands. Many of these lands can be managed to simultaneously provide timber, water, wildlife habitat, and many forms of recreation. This is the essence of the multiple-use charter which the Congress has established for the National Forests. I believe that managing these lands for various combinations of uses makes them most productive in responding to the needs of our people.

Question 14. Recently, the issue of so-called "Below-cost timber sales" administered by the Forest Service on National Forests has received a great deal of attention. What steps do you intend to take to insure that the Agency's timber management program is conducted in an economically—and environmentally—sound fashion, with due consideration given to both the timber and other natural resources on our National Forests?

Answer. The resources of the National Forests must be managed efficiently. American taxpayers deserve a fair return from the sale or use of their natural resources, and, of course, these resources must be managed in an environmentally sound manner. I would work with the Forest Service to achieve these objectives.

There is controversy over how to measure the economic efficiency of the National Forest timber sale program which by law is conducted in the context of multiple use management. Generally, I feel the appropriate vehicle to resolve this issue is the Forest Land Management Plan prepared under the requirements of the National Forest Management Act, but there is a need to reach some agreement on this issue.

I am aware that the National Forests, particularly in the West, play a unique role in the social and economic well-being of many communities. These communities are dependent on National Forest timber and other resources for their economic survival. This fact must be given appropriate recognition in any policy decisions regarding the management of these Forests.

[Questions submitted by Senator Sasser to Mr. Dunlop and answers thereto:]

Question 1. Mr. Dunlop, on May 19, 1986 I wrote a letter to Secretary Lyng regarding the actions of the Forest Service in the Pisgah National Forest in North Carolina. I requested the Secretary to instruct the Forest Service to issue a declaration of taking for a 200-acre tract of land known as the Peake property, which runs along the Tennessee-North Carolina border and contains a portion of the Appalachian Trail. Are you at all familiar with this property or the Forest Service's actions in this regard?

Answer. Yes, I am generally informed that there exists a controversy involving the Peake property. In North Carolina we have referred to this as the "Roan Mountain" controversy. I am informed of this because of the relatively large amount of correspondence received from constituents on the subject by Senator Helms and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, and from newspaper articles which have come to my attention from time to time.

However, I have not been involved in any decisions on matters of substance relating to this issue.

Question 2. The Forest Service has protected more than 800 miles of the Appalachian Trail, through acquisition of property on a willing seller basis. Only 10 more miles remain to be protected by the Forest Service. Unfortunately, some of this remaining mileage will likely be acquired through the use of condemnation. Can you tell me whether you, as Administrator of the Forest Service, will uphold the statutory requirements of that Office regarding land acquisition in national forests, particularly the use of condemnation and declarations of taking where necessary?

Answer. I have a fundamental commitment to the principle that the concept of private property is necessary for the maintenance of a free society. The condemnation of private property is one of the strongest kinds of actions that a government can take against its citizens, and should be undertaken only in most extraordinary instances, and only as a last resort when all efforts have been taken by public agencies to acquire land needed for public purposes through mutual agreement and negotiation.

In some instances, condemnation actions cannot be avoided. However, such determinations can only be made on a case-by-case basis. When such cases arise, I will reluctantly use authorities that may be delegated to me to acquire needed public lands through condemnation.

Question 3. In the case of the Peake property, the Forest Service to date has not upheld its stewardship responsibilities. Due to the failure of the Forest Service to issue a declaration of taking on the property, the landowner has bulldozed a road on the property, destroying the scenic integrity of the Appalachian Trail along that section of the Roan Highlands, and has threatened further development of the property. Could you tell me whether, as Assistant Secretary, you would request a declaration of taking for the entire 200-acre Peake tract, if that appears to be the only means of protecting the integrity of the Appalachian Trail along that segment?

Answer. Very frankly, I am not possessed of sufficient knowledge of the details of this particular situation to give a response either in the affirmative or in the negative. It is my information that the Forest Service and the United States Attorney are in the process of attempting to negotiate acquisition with the owners of the Peake property. It is my hope that those negotiations will prove successful.

I do understand that should I be confirmed as Assistant Secretary, I will be responsible for protecting the integrity of that portion of the Appalachian Trail that is under Forest Service jurisdiction. I can assure the Senator, and the Committee, that I will take whatever actions are necessary and within my authority to properly discharge that responsibility, including condemnation and declarations of taking, where necessary.

APPENDIX

STATEMENT OF HON. BOB DOLE, A U.S. SENATOR FROM KANSAS

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure for me to comment on the nomination of George Dunlop for Assistant Secretary of Natural Resources and Environment within the Department of Agriculture. I will make just a few brief comments in support of George Dunlop for the position.

STAFF ROLE

I know it must be difficult for Senator Helms to lose such a valuable staff member as George has been. It can be very difficult for any Chairman to replace a Chief of Staff and especially one he has worked with for many years. I understand that George has been with Senator Helms since 1973, originally in the Raleigh, North Carolina Office as Director of State Activities and then as an agricultural specialist in Senator Helms' Washington office.

WORKING RELATIONSHIP

George has played an active role in shaping agricultural policy as the minority staff director from 1979 to 1981 and as Chief of Staff for the Committee since 1981. Not only has he been dedicated to the Chairman, he has also worked very hard and has been attentive to the concerns of the other committee members as well. I would say personally that I've enjoyed a close working relationship with George and have always found him to be cooperative and helpful to both me and my staff. I would like to personally express my appreciation for his hard work and efforts.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, I would underscore the fact that George Dunlop has been associated with agriculture for several years and has done a very professional job fulfilling a very important and many times a very difficult role. It is not an easy job making sure a committee runs smoothly and being intimately involved with the details of all of the legislative items that come before the Ag Committee, especially major farm bills. George has done a great job and is definitely qualified for the position. I know that he'll make the same type of contribution to the Department that he

has made here with the Senate Agriculture Committee and in agricultural policy matters.

STATEMENT OF HON. EDWARD ZORINSKY, A U.S. SENATOR FROM NEBRASKA

Mr. Chairman, George Dunlop has been nominated by the President for one of the most important positions at the Department of Agriculture--that of overseeing the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service.

The members of this Committee are all familiar with George's abilities and character. I am certain that every other member of the Committee shares my confidence that George will be an outstanding Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

It is my hope that we will have an expeditious hearing, waive the usual waiting period the Committee observes between holding a nomination hearing and voting on the nomination, and have the Senate speedily confirm George as Assistant Secretary.

STATEMENT OF HON. PAULA HAWKINS, A U.S. SENATOR FROM FLORIDA

I am pleased that the Committee is taking up the nomination of George Dunlop to be Assistant Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment at USDA. This is a big job. Mr. Dunlop will be responsible for two of the most important agencies at the Department of Agriculture. The Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service. After working with George Dunlop over the last 5 years, I am sure that he is up to the task.

The challenges ahead for both the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service are many. The 1985 Food Security Act provides the Soil Conservation Service with a number of new responsibilities. Important to my State of Florida is the program for the conservation of highly erodible soils and protection of wetlands. In addition to the sodbuster and swampbuster provision, daily administration of the acreage conservation reserve program will be under Mr. Dunlop's supervision.

In addition to these new programs in the 1985 farm bill, the daily administration of the Forest Service is part of the Assistant Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment's portfolio. Again this is important to Florida. We have three national forests in Florida including over 1 million acres. The importance of these areas with regard to timber, wildlife, and water issues cannot be overstated. As just one example, I hope you will remember that the national forests in Florida produce 600 billion gallons of water to surface and groundwater systems each year. Each day, 150 million gallons of water are produced by the springs in the national forests in Florida.

The Forest Service is currently putting the finishing touches on a new State plan for the utilization and management of the forests. I know that Mr. Dunlop stands ready to assist in the completion of the plan if his assistance is necessary. I would point out that Florida's State plan is not the only State plan

being completed at this time. So I am sure that you will have your hands full.

As I noted at the beginning, George Dunlop is about to take on a very big job. I am confident that he is up to the challenge. I thank the Committee and look forward to swift action on the nomination.

STATEMENT OF HON. PETE WILSON, A U.S. SENATOR FROM CALIFORNIA

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that this day has finally arrived, so that I can state publicly what I have already conveyed privately to George in a letter many weeks ago. Upon hearing of the President's intention to announce the nomination of our Committee's Staff Director to be Assistant Secretary of Natural Resources and Environment, I wrote George a short note of congratulations and pledged to him then what I am proud to announce now: my wholehearted support for his swift confirmation to that important position.

Each of us around this table fully realize that the position for which George has been nominated has responsibility for the biggest agencies within the Agriculture Department, including the Soil Conservation Service and the Forest Service.

In a State as large and diverse as California, there are innumerable matters which affect the environment and natural resources, and I am looking forward to working with our new Assistant Secretary. Although I fully realize that George is a native North Carolinian, one of the first things which immediately impressed me about him upon my arrival in 1983, was that he had the heart of a Californian. One of the second things which I learned about him was that, in his heart, he was also a Nebraskan and a Kansan and a Oklahoman and a Minnesotan and so forth around this table.

Indeed, he had to be in order to look after the unique and somethimes conflicting interests of the farmers in our various States. It is his "big-heartedness", among his many other qualities and experiences, which will serve him well as he moves to the Department as an Assistant Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, the good judgment which you displayed in 1981, when you appointed George Dunlop to be this Committee's staff director, has been demonstrated by the President by this nomination. It is my hope and expectation that this committee and the entire Senate will display the same good judgment by acting favorably and promptly on this nominee. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF HON. MITCH McCONNELL, A U.S. SENATOR FROM KENTUCKY

Mr. Chairman: It is with considerable pleasure that I add my wholehearted endorsement of George Dunlop to be the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources and Environment. The only regret that I have is that he's leaving a leadership

vacuum on this Committee staff that will be very difficult to fill.

My closest work with George has been, of course, on the comprehensive tobacco reform proposal offered by the Chairman and myself. Throughout that slow and difficult process, I always found George to be accessible and accommodating in every possible way. His instincts and judgments were always sound and our negotiated agreement between tobacco growers and cigarette manufacturers would not have been possible without his strong leadership.

To my colleagues on the Committee, as the most Junior Republican on the Committee, I must tell you how impressed I was with the way George Dunlop handled the business of the Committee during the mark-up of the 1985 farm bill. Not only did he speak with authority on virtually every part of the farm bill, but his handling of staff, lobbyists, constituents, administration officials, not to mention, U.S. Senators was amazing. His patience matches that of the Chairman's.

The very large shoes of Peter Myers will be ably filled by George Dunlop in his new position at the Department of Agriculture. I'm confident that George's basic philosophies will lead to an aggressive, yet responsible, rural environmental plan. The conservation reserve section of the 1985 farm bill is one of the few parts of the bill that everybody says is good; the challenge now is to effectively administer the program in such a way so as to meet the intent of Congress when the farm bill was written. I imagine that George will be an imminent authority on Congressional intent when he gets down to USDA.

We'll no doubt miss George's leadership greatly on this Committee, but this is also a great personal opportunity for Mr. Dunlop to hone his own skills before he embarks on his next adventure in the business world. I have complete confidence that George will be a success in whatever he does. I offer my personal thanks for all he's done for me and for this Committee and best wishes for a prosperous future.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF HON. ALAN J. DIXON, A U.S. SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be here this morning as we consider the nomination of George Dunlop to be the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources and Environment.

I have enjoyed working with George during my tenure as a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, and I am pleased to support his nomination. All of us look forward to working with George in his new position at the Department of Agriculture.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

United States Office of Government Ethics,
Washington, D.C., May 27, 1986.

Honorable Jesse A. Helms
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
Nutrition, and Forestry
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

In accordance with the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, I enclose a copy of the financial disclosure report filed by George S. Dunlop, who has been nominated by President Reagan for the position of Assistant Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment, Department of Agriculture.

We have reviewed the report and have also obtained advice from the Department of Agriculture concerning any possible conflict in light of the Department's functions and the nominee's proposed duties. Based thereon, we believe that Mr. Dunlop is in compliance with applicable laws and regulations governing conflicts of interest.

Sincerely,

David H. Martin, Director.

Enclosure.*

---

* Retained in Committee files.

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry,
Washington, D.C., June 2, 1986.

Honorable Jesse Helms
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
Nutrition, and Forestry
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

On April 28, I submitted to the Office of Government Ethics a copy of my SF 278, Financial Disclosure Report, required in connection with my nomination to serve as Assistant Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment for the U.S. Department of Agriculture. That report contained all required financial information for calendar year 1985 and for the current calendar year through April 28, 1986.

The Ethics in Government Act of 1978, as amended, also requires that I update certain information reported on the SF 278, i.e., that required by section 202(a)(1)(A) of the Act, respecting income (other than dividends, interest, rents, and capital gains) and honoraria, to a date which occurs five days before the date of the hearing held by the Committee to consider my nomination. The hearing to be held on my nomination is presently scheduled for Thursday, June 5, 1986. The purpose of this letter is to report that, as of June 2, 1986, I have received no income or honoraria

in addition to those categories and amounts of income shown on my Financial Disclosure Report as dated and filed on April 28, 1986.

I trust that this letter satisfies the additional applicable reporting requirements contained in the Ethics in Government Act.

Sincerely

George S. Dunlop, Chief of Staff.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF MR. DUNLOP

George S. Dunlop has served as Chief of Staff of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry since January 1981. From 1979 to 1981, he served as Minority Staff Director for the Committee.

In these capacities, he has been responsible for the oversight and legislative activities of the Committee in all areas of the Committee's jurisdiction, which include agricultural programs, banking and credit, the futures trading industry, international trade, regulatory activities, research and technology, forestry and environmental issues, domestic welfare programs, and foreign assistance programs.

From 1973 to 1979, Mr. Dunlop served as a special assistant to Senator Jesse Helms, for 2 years as director of State activities from the Raleigh, North Carolina office, and then as an agricultural specialist in the Washington office.

Mr. Dunlop has served on two international delegations: In 1984, as a co-member of the U.S. Information Agency delegation to Europe and in 1982 as a member of the U.S. delegation to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) in Geneva.

In addition, he has served as Director of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Platform Committee to the Republican National Convention in both 1980 and 1984. In 1980, he also served on the Reagan for President Agriculture Advisory Committee and transition team.

Mr. Dunlop was born in Charlotte, North Carolina, and is a native of Salisbury, N.C. He earned his B.A. degree from Catawba College in Salisbury in 1970; an M.A. from Lehigh University in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania in 1972.

From 1966-1968, he served on active duty in the U.S. Marine Corps, and continued in the Marine Corps Reserve from 1968-1978, where he was a logistics management specialist.

He is married to Becky Norton Dunlop, and they reside in Arlington, Virginia.

STATEMENT OF BARRY R. FLAMM, CHIEF FORESTER, THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Barry R. Flamm, chief forester, of The Wilderness Society.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to present testimony on behalf of The Wilderness Society's 150,000 members regarding George S. Dunlop's confirmation as the Assistant Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment. The position has direct responsibility for the U.S. Forest Service and Soil Conservation

Service and Department-wide mandate to monitor and coordinate environmental policy. Since its inception The Wilderness Society has maintained a strong interest in the national forests. The Society is dedicated to the principle of balanced multiple use of the nation's forests and rangelands and to the protection of our wildlands.

The Wilderness Society does not oppose the appointment of Mr. Dunlop to the nominated position. He has served the U.S. Congress for many years and has gained considerable political and legislative experience. We are hopeful that Mr. Dunlop will seek the best available information on the unique values of public forest lands and that future decisions will be aimed at meeting the needs and wishes of the greater American public.

Although The Society strongly opposed the nomination and confirmation of John C. Crowell, this Administration's initial Assistant Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment, we did not oppose his replacement, Peter C. Myers. Instead, we challenged Mr. Myers to correct five major problems in current national forest management. Specifically, we urged Mr. Myers to:

(1) Implement better multiple use management of the national forests through balanced funding of programs;
(2) Reduce and eliminate taxpayer subsidies of commercial interests on the national forests, including mineral development, grazing, and below-cost timber sales;
(3) Critically examine the Forest Service road construction program, reducing road building that is ecologically damaging and economically unsound;
(4) Insist on high quality forest plans that meet the intent of legislation governing the national forests.

Because of Mr. Myers' accomplishments in soil conservation, we were hopeful that under his leadership the Department of Agriculture and Forest Service would make progress in addressing these problems. However, we have been disappointed by the lack of attention given to them. In fact, the problems have worsened. Program funding imbalances and taxpayer subsidies of commercial interests have increased under present policies. The Forest Service continues to pursue unnecessary and environmentally unsound road construction, and most of the forest plans issued so far thwart the intent of the National Forest Management Act.

Mr. Dunlop, if he is confirmed, must address these issues. Forest Service policies of managing the national forests in an economically and ecologically unsound way cannot continue. We encourage Mr. Dunlop to develop and implement a new vision for our forest lands--a vision that encompasses fundamental changes in management policy to allow national forest resources to make the greatest possible contribution to the future well being of the country. We suggest that this vision include the following goals.

(1) Land management based on sound stewardship practices--enhancing soil, watershed, and wildlife productivity, maintaining biological diversity, and protecting cultural resources and scenic beauty.
(2) Commodity development that protects and enhances the ability of renewable resources to replenish themselves in perpetuity--development should not degrade other forest resources and values.

(3) Logging only on suitable timberland--this should be based on site-specific evaluations of economic, physical and environmental factors.
(4) Preservation of wildlands on national forests.
(5) Protection of biological diversity, watersheds, and outdoor recreation--these resources should be given priority over resource exploitation.

Mr. Dunlop has an excellent opportunity to reshape policies and management practices on the national forests through the budget process. As we have demonstrated through testimony before the Congress, significant environmental benefits can be achieved while reducing Federal budget outlays for managing the national forests. We strongly recommend that Mr. Dunlop support phasing out below-cost timber sales, eliminating unnecessary forest road construction, and reducing the Tongass timber supply fund. These actions alone could save taxpayers more than $100 million next year. The budget deficit could be further reduced if the Federal Government insisted on receiving fair market value for products provided by national forests, such as timber and forage from rangeland. The Forest Service program could be further improved if a portion of these savings and revenues were devoted to critically under-financed programs such as soil and water protection, wildlife and fish, dispersed recreation and trails, and land acquisitions.

If he is confirmed, we urge Mr. Dunlop to place high priority on national forest issues. It is critical for the person who fills this position to develop a long term vision for the forests and to begin reshaping the Forest Service budget in way that reflects this vision and resolves the problems outlined here.

I thank the Committee for its time and attention.

McClure & Trotter,
Washington, D.C., June 2, 1986.

Re: Nonimination of George S. Dunlop

Senator Jesse Helms
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
Nutrition, and Forestry
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Chairman Helms:

I am writing in my personal capacity to give my strongest support to the nomination of George S. Dunlop to be Assistant Secretary of Natural Resources and Environment.

I have known George for over 10 years, serving with him in the early 1970's in the Marine Corps Reserve, where I was always impressed with his professionalism, integrity and good judgment. In addition, I have had various dealings with him in this capacity as chief of staff for the Agriculture Committee in matters involving sugar and tobacco. In each such matter, I have found him to be extremely analytical, knowledgeable and fair, always giving each side an opportunity to present its best case.

I think he will make an outstanding Assistant Secretary of Agriculture and heartily endorse his nomination.

Sincerely,

Robert W. Johnson.